

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 EC BRU 11970 071800Z

53

ACTION IO-13

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDA-07 CIAE-00 INR-07 L-03
NSAE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 NRC-05 OES-06 FEAЕ-00 DODE-00
IOE-00 /066 W

----- 030253

P R 071536Z DEC 76

FM USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2520

INFO USMISSION IAEA VIENNA PRIORITY

ALL EC CAPITALS 2832

ERDA WASHDCING

ERDA GERMANTOWN

C O N F I D E N T I A L EC BRUSSELS 11970

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: TECH, EEC

SUBJ: EURATOM/IAEA SAFEGUARDS

REF: (A) VIENNA 9731; (B) EC BRUSSELS 11406; (C) EC BRUSSELS
11969

1. MISSION IS SOMEWHAT PERPLEXED AND CONCERNED ABOUT THE TONE
AND CONTENT OF REFTEL A. OF PERHAPS GREATEST CONCERN IS THE
ALLEGATION (PARA 7, EFTEL A) THAT EURATOM AND JAPAN ARE IN-
FORMALLY WORKING TOGETHER TO DEGRADE OR SOFTEN NUCLEAR SAFE-
GUARDS. WE HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THIS
SERIOUS CHARGE AND FROM CONVERSATIONS WITH RESPONSIBLE EC
OFFICIALS WE DOUBT ITS ACCURACY. WE WOULD APPRECIATE ANY
EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORT THE ALLEGATIONS.

2. ADDITIONALLY, REFTEL A FAILS TO RECOGNIZE THE MULTINATIONAL
CHARACTER OF THE EURATOM SAFEGUARDS SYSTEM. IT IS NOT APPROPRIATE
IN ARGUING FOR THE NEED FOR INDEPENDENCE OF IAEA VERIFICATION
TO EQUATE EURATOM WITH INDIVIDUAL NATIONS. THE MULTINATIONAL
CHARACTER OF THE EURATOM SYSTEM WAS RECOGNIZED IN ARTICLE 11
OF THE PROTOCOL OF THE 1973 IAEA/EURATOM VERIFICATION AGREEMENT
(HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS THE AGREEMENT).

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 EC BRU 11970 071800Z

3. WE HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO FIND EVIDNCE OF EURATOM (EC) EFFORTS

TO DENY INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION BY IAEA OR TO HAVE IAEA DELEGATE ITS VERIFICATION RESPONSIBILITIES TO EURATOM. ON THE CONTRARY, A CAREFUL REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED EC REGULATION FOR OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBER STATES (REFTEL B) AGAINST THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REVEALS A VERY CLOSE CORRELATION. THE DEGREE OF INDEPENDENT IAEA INSPECTION IN THE PROPOSED REGULATION APPEARS TO US TO BE TOTALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT. SOME SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS RELATED TO CONTENTIONS IN REFTEL A FOLLOW:

(A) REFTEL A STATES THAT EURATOM INSISTS THAT IAEA NEED ONLY "OBSERVE" EURATOM SAFEGUARDS OPERATIONS. THIS IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE PROPOSED EC REGULATION WHICH ALLOWS FOR CONSIDERABLE INDEPENDENT IAEA INSPECTION (ARTICLES 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 AND 10 OF THE PROPOSED REGULATION). THE AGREEMENT, INCIDENTIALLY, ENCOURAGES THE AGENCY TO IMPLEMENT ITS OBLIGATIONS ONLY BY OBSERVATION WHENEVER IT CAN ACHIEVE ITS PURPOSES THROUGH THAT TECHNIQUE. (SEE ARTICLE 75 OF THE AGREEMENT AND ARTICLES 14B AND 24 OF THE ACCOMPANYING PROTOCOL.)

(B) PARA 5 OF REFTEL A EMPHASIZES AGAIN THE POSITION THAT THE IAEA CANNOT DELGATE ITS RESPONSIBILITY FOR VERIFICATION AND INDEPENDENT MEASUREMENT TO THE STATE. WE DO NOT ARGUE WITH THAT BUT WOULD POINT OUT AGAIN THAT EURATOM IS A MULTINATIONAL, EVEN SUPRANATIONAL, OPERATION, AND ALSO, AS NOTED ABOVE, WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THE EC IS ASKING IAEA TO DELEGATE ITS RESPONSIBILITY.

(C) PARA 8 OF REFTEL A NOTES CONCERN THAT PROPOSED EC REGULATION WILL CREATE UNDESIRABLE IMPEDIMENTS TO AGENCY'S FREELY EXERCISING ITS RIGHTS OF INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION. SPECIFIC REFERENCE WAS MADE TO ARTICLE 10 OF THAT REGULATION WHICH REQUIRES, INTER ALIA, CERTAIN WRITTEN DECLARATIONS FROM THE AGENCY PRIOR TO CARRYING OUT INDEPENDENT INSPECTION ACTIVITIES DURING THE COURSE OF ROUTINE INSPECTIONS. SUCH PRE-NOTICE IS CALLED FOR IN ARTICLE 77 OF THE AGREEMENT WHICH REQUIRES SPECIFIC CONSULTATION BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY AND THE AGENCY UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES.

(D) PARA 9 OF REFTEL A IDENTIFIES AS A PROBLEM THAT EC INDUSTRIES ARE OPPOSED TO ACCEPTING AN INCREASED SAFEGUARDS BURDEN AS A RESULT OF THE AGREEMENT. WE DO NOT FIND THIS TO BE AN UNREASONABLE OR UNEXPECTED ATTITUDE. INDEED, THIS CONCERN WAS RECOGNIZED IN THE AGREEMENT WHICH IS REPLETE WITH CONDITIONS INTENDED TO PROTECT THESE INDUSTRIES FROM REDUNDANT

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 EC BRU 11970 071800Z

EFFORTS (E.G. ARTICLES 4, 5, 8, 9, 31, 82, 84, 87, AND ARTICLES 1, 11, 13, 14, AND 24 OF THE PROTOCOL).

(E) PARA 11 OF REFTEL A IDENTIFIES AS THE BASIC QUESTION WHETHER U.S. CONCERN FOR CONFLICT WITHIN EURATOM SHOULD OVERRIDE U.S. CONCERN FOR EFFECTIVENSS AND CREDIBILITY OF IAEA SAFEGUARDS. AS NOTED ABOVE, WE DO NOT FULLY SHARE U.S. MISSION VIENNA'S VIEWS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION VIS-A-VIS IAEA AND EURATOM. ADMITTEDLY, THE FAILURE OF THE EC TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED

REGULATION IS OF CONSIDERABLE CONCERN AS PREVIOUSLY REPORTED AND WE CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT U.S. APPROACH TO FRANCE MIGHT BE A WORTHWHILE ACTION. HOWEVER, WE CANNOT AGREE THAT THE EC IS ATTEMPTING TO DOWNGRADE IAEA'S EFFECTIVENESS OR CREDIBILITY NOR IS IT ATTEMPTING TO SOFTEN ITS OWN SAFEGUARDS ACTIVITIES. WE BELIEVE THAT THE MORE BASIC QUESTION IS WHETHER THE U.S. WILL BE SATISFIED THAT THE RESULTING SAFEGUARDS SYSTEM FOR THE EURATOM COUNTRIES WILL BE APPROPRIATE TO PRESERVE OUR NONPROLIFERATION OBJECTIVES. TO THIS END, WE WOULD ARGUE THAT THE EXISTING EURATOM SAFEGUARDS HAVE PROVEN TO BE EFFECTIVE AND THAT THE REALIGNED SYSTEM TO ACCOMMODATE IAEA PROCEDURES WILL, IF ANYTHING, FURTHER STRENGTHEN THE DEGREE OF NONPROLIFERATION CONTROL WITHIN THE EURATOM COUNTRIES.

4. WE DO NOT BELIEVE A USEFUL PURPOSE WOULD BE SERVED IN U.S. RE-EMPHASIS TO EURATOM MEMBER STATES OF ITS CONCERN FOR ASSURING EFFECTIVE IAEA SAFEGUARDS, AS RECOMMENDED IN REFTEL A. WITH THE PRESENT SITUATION OF EC ATTEMPTING TO REACH FINAL AGREEMENT ON THE PROPOSED REGULATION WE BELIEVE THAT SUCH U.S. APPROACHES AT THIS TIME WOULD BE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE. BETTER THAT U.S. TAKE ACTION TO ASSIST THE EC IN FINAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VERIFICATION AGREEMENT (I.E. APPROACH FRANCE). WE BELIEVE THAT EURATOM AND IAEA WILL BE ABLE TO WORK OUT ANY REMAINING DETAILED DISAGREEMENTS WITHOUT COMPROMISING NONPROLIFERATION OBJECTIVES. HINTON

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: NPT, NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS, NUCLEAR COOPERATION PROGRAMS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 07 DEC 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ElyME
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976ECBRU11970
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760451-1129
From: EC BRUSSELS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19761267/aaaacfwp.tel
Line Count: 140
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION IO
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 76 VIENNA 9731, 76 EC BRUSSELS 11406
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ElyME
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 24 MAR 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <24 MAR 2004 by hartledg>; APPROVED <13 AUG 2004 by ElyME>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: EURATOM/IAEA SAFEGUARDS
TAGS: TECH, US, EEC, EURATOM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006